



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF PAUL.

I. THE SOCIAL CONTENT OF EARLY MESSIANISM.

By SHAILER MATHEWS,
The University of Chicago.

AS THE immediate successors of Jesus, the apostles might naturally be expected to have found material for their teaching in that of his. That the early church possessed the ethical teachings of Jesus essentially as they appear in our synoptic gospels is, of course, undeniable, for it must have been the early church that preserved for us such teachings as have been grouped in these gospels. That these teachings were well known and revered is further argued, not alone by literature like the epistle of Clement and the Didache, but quite as strongly by the appearance of gospels purporting to relate some authoritative act or word of the Master. The social environment in which Christianity found itself as it swept out from Palestine was by no means simple, and the problems attendant upon the application of the idealism of Jesus to Græco-Roman society were certainly difficult enough to warrant the most elaborate analysis of the great principles which he had taught. Further, the probability that the early apostles would be the expositors of the social teachings of Jesus is strengthened by the fact that the apostles were accustomed to precisely such a method of enforcing religious truth. Paul had been trained in the rabbinical schools, where the most painstaking and penetrating analysis of the Thorah of Moses had resulted in an enormous extension of Mosaic principles to the minutest act of life. It would seem that it must have been almost inevitable that he should have treated Jesus' teaching as he had treated the Pentateuch, and have made it the basis of innumerable *halachoth*; and that his fellow-apostles, even though not rabbis, in presenting the ideals of Christian life should have followed their teachers and

turned to the words of their Christ as an authoritative constitution from which to draw statutes for the regulation of social life.

Even a cursory reading of the apostolic literature will disclose how incorrect are these *a priori* conjectures. In all the writings of Paul there are but three distinct references to the words of Jesus, and in but one case is there an appeal to his words as a basis for regulating social life. So far were the other apostles from being interpreters of the teachings of Jesus that, if we had no other source than their canonical writings from which to derive information, we could hardly be sure that he had given any teachings of any sort whatsoever. As far as social matters are concerned, this paradox is rendered even more remarkable by the fact that Paul is constantly dealing with precisely those problems of the family and other social relations with which Jesus himself dealt, and that, too, not incidentally. His purpose was farthest possible from being primarily theological. Theology, even the most abstract, was with him a basis of ethics. Yet, though he called himself the slave of Christ, he all but never quoted his Master's commands.

The explanation of this fact must be found in the point of view occupied by the apostle. The Christ had come, had ascended to heaven. Thence he was presently to appear to establish his kingdom.

But this is evidently a phase of a hope known to every student of Hebrew and Jewish literature—messianism.

Apostolic Christianity gave a new character to the elements of messianism, but it did not destroy it as a form of thought. To discover its social contents, and how regulative it was of Paul's thought and teaching, must be the first task of any man who would understand the apostle.

SECTION I. THE SOCIAL AND NATIONAL MESSIANISM OF THE PROPHETS.

Messianism is that fixed social belief of the Jewish people that Jehovah would deliver Israel, and erect it into a glorious empire to which a conquered world would be subject. It sometimes, indeed generally, involved the hope of a personal

king—the Messiah, the Anointed One of God—but its central and ever-present thought was that of the divinely established kingdom rather than the king. Fundamentally it was the child of the prophets' faith in Jehovah's care for an oppressed Israel. From the time that the first Hebrew dared to speak forth in Jehovah's name and promise his downtrodden fellow-countrymen divine deliverance from all their complaints, the Jewish race mitigated political oppression with ideal utopias. Primitive enough were these hopes in some of their aspects, fit products of a cruel and barbarous age. A conquering Israel, a Davidic king, a suppliant, terrorized, tortured world—these were the dreams which Jehovah was to make real. But, as prophecy advanced in religious and ethical conceptions, with this elemental optimism there was associated an ever-growing sense of Israel's moral and religious isolation. As a consequence, although barbarity still displayed itself in all forecasts of the future of heathendom, ethical ideals were infused into the hopes for the triumph of Israel. As the Hebrew religion grew moral, so the Hebrew utopias grew religious. Compared with the hopes of New Testament times, it is true, they were lacking in those transcendental elements that are commonly associated with messianism, but they were none the less of the same general nature. That they were full of social content is clear from the Hebrew literature,¹ even if many elements in early literature be attributed to the prophetic spirit of later editors. The historical basis of the messianic ideal was the glorious reign of David and Solomon, and in the pictures of the ideal kings given in the "royal" psalms² there beats the inextinguishable optimism of a nation's faith in a divinely assured future. Early prophets, like Elijah and Elisha, saw in the religious and political crises resulting from the division of the kingdom of Solomon an opportunity to urge higher national ideals upon both the masses and the court. The

¹ For the collection of these sayings see GOODSPEED, *Israel's Messianic Hope* (with good bibliography); DELITZSCH, *Messianic Prophecies*; HÜHN, *Die messianischen Weissagungen*.

² Pss. 2; 24:7-10; 45; 72; 110. Cf. GOODSPEED, *Israel's Messianic Hope*, pp. 72, 73.

calamities that threatened Israel, even during the brilliant reign of Jeroboam II., served as texts, not only for the dark forebodings of Amos, but for Hosea's prophecies of prosperity and peace that would come to the remnant of the nation when once it turned from idols and foreign alliances to a forgiving Jehovah.³ In the disasters and miseries that came to both kingdoms during the days of Tiglathpileser III., Sargon, and Sennacherib, Isaiah unfolded to Judah a religio-international policy that promised national deliverance and prosperity under a divinely appointed king,⁴ and, as if to guarantee the certainty of the new nation, he set about the preparation of a "remnant" which should be its nucleus.⁵ Micah also promised an empire to a faithful nation.⁶ That Judah refused to listen to the words of these prophets makes all the more evident the social and political elements in their discourses. In fact, even if one should overlook the elaborate social provisions of Deuteronomy, propheticism, as a whole, was concerned with a regenerate Hebrew nation and a righteous king. That against which it cried out was such matters as the oppression of the poor, the formation of great landed estates, luxury, avarice, international policies, and national bad faith. Yet in denunciations there is the persistent trust in the nation's God. Even after the fading of Isaiah's promised future, Jeremiah, convinced though he was that Judah must certainly fall before the Chaldeans, yet looked beyond the approaching captivity to a restoration of the nation. Jehovah had made a new covenant with his people,⁷ and his law was to be planted deep in their hearts as an inward guide. While it is true that the prophet does not describe in detail ideal institutions, it is clear from his denunciation of economic oppression⁸ that just social conditions must have figured largely in his conception of the new covenant and the restored state.

With the exile this religio-political messianic hope, thus far so general and impersonal, passed into a new stage. The

³ For instance, Hos. 2 : 19-23 ; 14 : 1-8.

⁴ Isa. 2 : 2-4 ; 4 : 2-6 ; 9 : 2-7 ; 11 : 1-9 ; 19 : 19-25.

⁵ Isa. 8 : 16-18.

⁷ Jer. 31 : 31-44 ; 33 : 17-22.

⁶ Mic. 4 : 1-5.

⁸ Jer. 7 : 1-15.

misery suffered by the Jews deported to Babylon, and the wonder that Jehovah could permit so great national and individual suffering, resulted in the formation of that pious remnant which Isaiah and Jeremiah had foreseen. Out from the misery there sprang fresh faith in a rapidly approaching divine deliverance. Ezekiel in Babylon planned a new commonwealth centered about a temple rebuilt with extravagant splendor. Religious as the hope of the exile was, and formally non-messianic as the Priestly Code undoubtedly is,⁹ each was none the less social,¹⁰ and never more so than when the sorrows of the good men of the nation were distinctly made vicarious¹¹ for the nation itself. In no other literature has the problem of national and communal suffering been more nobly faced and answered.

Throughout this period of prophetic optimism there ran a developing social theory that at last was to be incorporated in an actual society. At the outset the prophets had thought of the nation as a whole; Isaiah saw that the "remnant" alone carried with it the future; Jeremiah, though still hoping for the "remnant," saw also the religious and social importance of the individual; Ezekiel, appreciating, as perhaps no other Hebrew, the value of the individual, began a new process of national reconstruction. No longer looking to the nation, or even the

⁹ MONTEFIORE, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 319.

¹⁰ Ezek. II: 14-20; 37: 21-28.

¹¹ Isa. 52:13-53:12. The interpretation of this passage, so generally considered by Christians as applicable to Jesus, in Jewish literature is social; the sufferer is not the Christ, but Israel, either a nation or the pious scribes (Bab. *Siphre*, 48b; Bab. *Berach.*, 5a and 57b; *Sota*, 14a; Jer. *Shekualim*, 48c; Bereshith Rabba, 20, 1) in Israel. (Cf. JUSTIN, *Dial. Trypho.*, 122, 123; ORIGEN, *Ag. Celsus*, I, 55.) The reference of *San.*, 98b, according to Edersheim (*Jesus the Messiah*, Vol. II, p. 741), is to the Messiah as the "leprous one of the house of Rabbi." But this is from the second or third century, and represents the opinion of only a school of rabbis. See DALMAN, *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias*, pp. 28 f. Cf. also BUDDE, "The So-Called 'Ebed-Yahweh Songs' and the Meaning of the Term 'Servant of Yahweh' in Isaiah, Chaps. XL-LV," *Amer. Journal of Theology*, Vol. III, pp. 499 f.; MONTEFIORE, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 278 f.; CHEYNE, *Prophecies of Isaiah*, Vol. II, Essays iii-v; WRIGHT, "Pre-Christian Jewish Interpretation of Isa. lii-liv," *Expositor*, June, 1888; NEUBAUER-DRIVER, *Catena of Jewish Interpretations of Isa. liii*. There is at present a considerable tendency toward an individualistic, or at least non-social, interpretation. The Servant is the typical good man whose sufferings are inexplicable from the point of view of nomism, unless they are vicarious.

remnant, as the unit, he attempted to bring all godly individuals into the godly remnant, and this, in turn, into a glorious nation under holy priests and a Davidic king. Thus the cycle of ideals was completed. Nothing remained except to bring these ideals of Ezekiel and the pious men of the exile into an actual commonwealth. And that it attempted this is, perhaps, the greatest significance of that event known as the return.

When, through the favor of the Persian Cyrus, Judea again took something like its old place in the world, it was with the determination on the part of its reconstructors to found a theocratic state in which a completed Thorah was to regulate all matters of social life. But this was simply to embody the formulation of prophetic ideals; and this is only to say that the return was an attempt to institutionalize prophetic messianism. Such an attempt was, in fact, all but inevitable. The prophets had expected that the divine deliverance would consist in the establishment of a Hebrew nation as untranscendental as Assyria and Egypt, its confederates,¹² and through the agency of no more miraculous intervention than would be involved in any political readjustment like the triumph of Assyria¹³ or of Cyrus.¹⁴

The righteousness that was to characterize this new Israel was that elaborated in the later code, and obviously was thought of as involving all social relations. How else can one estimate the appearance of the Levitical code, the covenant not only to maintain the temple and its worship, but also to avoid mixed marriages, not to trade with "the people of the land" on the sabbath or a holy day, to let the land lie fallow, to observe the sabbatical year, and not to exact payment of debts?¹⁵

But we are not limited to such evidence of an attempt to institutionalize messianism. In the prophecies that may reasonably be assigned to this period the significance of the new commonwealth is described in messianic colors. In no other prophets is the certainty of national deliverance and prosperity through Jehovah's presence more emphasized. The one prerequisite is the observance of the Thorah by the individual,

¹² Isa. 19: 19-25.

¹⁴ Isa. 44: 28; 45: 1.

¹³ Isa. 10: 5.

¹⁵ Neh. 10: 29-31.

and the maintenance of the temple by the nation.¹⁶ Then, too, appeared that hope which was to play so great a rôle in early Christianity, that in those days, so soon to dawn, Jehovah would send his spirit upon a pious Israel to inspire new prophetic zeal and visions.¹⁷ The coronation of Zerubbabel seemed to Haggai and Zechariah the fulfilment of the promise of a prince from the house of David,¹⁸ and thus one more feature in the messianic kingdom. The Judah of the return was to be the fulfilment of the prophets' promises. A state was to be founded in which all social life was to be regulated by the divine Torah.

SECTION II. THE RISE OF APOCALYPTIC MESSIANISM.

With the establishment of the ineffectual messianic commonwealth, the prophetic messianism passed over into the messianism of Judaism. The transition resulted, not in the destruction of the social content of the older hope, but in the development of a supplementary messianic conception. The first stages of this new evolution it is hard to trace. In part the new element was the outcome of scribism, and, unfortunately, scribism during the Persian and Macedonian period has left few impressions upon Jewish literature. If Jews hoped for divine deliverance between Malachi and Judas Maccabæus, they have left all but no record of their hopes. Yet the years were critical in the development of Judaism. It is from them that we may trace the development, not only of nomism, but of the second great element of pharisaism—apocalyptic messianism.

As pharisaism on its legalistic side was the outgrowth of the codes, so on its idealistic side was it the outgrowth of prophetism. The forerunner of apocalyptic must be sought in what had been a regulative thought of prophetism, the Day of Jehovah—that time when the God of Israel would exercise his right and inflict terrible punishment upon all those who had not kept his law. What this day had been to Israel before Amos may be conjectured from the national belief in Jehovah as a God certain

¹⁶ Hag. 1:13; 2:6-9; Zech. 2:1-5, 12, 17; 8:1-8, 12, 20-23; and especially Isa. 60:1-22.

¹⁷ Joel 2:28, 29.

¹⁸ Hag. 2:23; Zech. 3:8, 12.

to defeat all rivals; it was to be a day of joy and peace for a conquering Hebrew nation.¹⁹ With Amos and the great prophets who succeeded him the Day became one in which Israel was to be punished by Jehovah for its sins. Instead of glory there was to be frightful suffering. The luxury of the nation, springing as it did from economic oppression, had grown hateful to the prophet and his God,²⁰ and the degenerate people was to be destroyed as a vindication of Jehovah's righteousness.

Ever after Amos the Day had the same religious coloring. Yet it was no longer to be a punishment merely of a wicked Israel, but of a wicked world. Zephaniah saw an all but universal judgment day, for Jews as well as heathen.²¹ Ezekiel conceived of it as a day of battle in which Jehovah would conquer all of Israel's foes.²² Later prophets, like Malachi, foretold the fearful punishment to be then meted out upon all wicked, Jew and gentile alike. Whatever hope of deliverance the Day might contain was for the pious remnant.

After the exile this thought of deliverance from their enemies naturally grew stronger among a people consciously striving to keep Jehovah's law, and thus the Day became assimilated with the new messianic hope. All its terrors were believed to be reserved for the enemies of the new Judah.²³ Religious faith lost itself in visions, and revenge found earthly warfare insufficient for its purposes. A new rhetoric was demanded, in which the extremes of pessimism as to the present and the wildest optimism for the future might be properly exhibited. And then arose the apocalypse.

One cannot be far from the truth if he considers the apocalypse the exposition of the Day of Jehovah in a literary form resulting from the Hellenistic influences under which the Jews

¹⁹ See the discussion by J. M. P. SMITH, "The Day of Yahweh," *American Journal of Theology*, July, 1901, pp. 505 f.

²⁰ Amos 2:6-8; 3:9-15; 5:10-13; 6:4-8. HARPER, "The Prophecies of Amos Strophically Arranged," *BIBLICAL WORLD*, 1898. Cf. MCCURDY, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, Vol. I, pp. 308 f.

²¹ Zeph. 3:8, 14-20, however, argue the exception of Judah. If this is late, 1:2-18; 2:4-15, present the Day with sufficient distinctness.

²² Ezek. 30:2 f.; 34:12; 39:8 f.

²³ Cf. Joel 2:18-27.

lived even from before the days of Alexander. This influence was both philosophical and æsthetic. Of philosophy was born Wisdom, and of æsthetics was born apocalyptic. Greek influence always prompted a people to some form of æsthetic expression, but the new art, in so far as it was not simply imitative, was determined by a people's past. As the Greek turned to marble and bronze and canvas as the media in which to perpetuate his anthropomorphic symbols of truth and hopes, the Jew, fearing to make to himself any graven image, used language for his statues and his paintings. Utterly lacking in a knowledge of technique,²⁴ hardly venturing to look at a Greek god or goddess, deficient in the very elements of art, he painted his word-pictures as he had seen the uncouth monsters of Egypt and Assyria. His symbols became strange creatures with eagles' wings and lions' bodies, legs of brass, and feet of clay. Unity was as lacking in the composition of his pictures as in their units. Bulls and buffaloes and sheep and goats and birds and shepherds jostled each other in his visions, and the fixed order of nature was unhesitatingly reversed. Yet in all these inartistic, confused symbols stands the one great thought of the prophetic Day of Jehovah. God will judge mankind, will gloriously deliver a righteous Israel from oppression, will indescribably punish the wicked and the heathen, and will establish a regenerate Judah as the head of the entire world.

It is not to our purpose to discuss how far these composite pictures of pessimism and extravagant hope were also influenced by the creation myths of Babylon. That there was such influence is clear, not alone from the characters and scheme of each apocalypse,²⁵ but from the fact of the appearance of this bastard prophetism among those who had been subjected to the influences of the exile. Yet the apocalypse really belongs to the Greek period of Jewish history. While visions were not unknown to genuine prophetism, it is not until the post-exilic second Zechariah²⁶ that a true apocalypse is met in Hebrew literature. As

²⁴ Cf., for instance, the bas-relief decoration in the castle of Hyrcanus, east of Jordan, in *'Arak el-Amir* (JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*, xii, 4 : 11).

²⁵ See GUNKEL, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 286-93, for summary.

²⁶ Zech., chaps. 9-14.

might have been expected, this first apocalypse deals, however interruptedly, with the Day of Jehovah, although "that day" is preferred to this precise term. There, as always, its chief content is that of punishment, but along with threats there are the promises of blessings. For Israel was to be repentant, and out from its sorrow was to come deliverance. But wild as are the figures with which these complementary thoughts are set forth, it would be untrue to the general spirit inspiring the early apocalyptic writing to think of its visions as in the strictest sense eschatological.²⁷ A complete eschatology was possible only when to other hopes there was joined some recognition of the resurrection of the dead. In a general sense, it is true, one might call these forecastings of the future eschatological, but only in the sense that the apocalypses looked across the culmination of one "age" into the events of another. Farther than this it is impossible to go. The synthesis of the nation's and the individual's future attempted by Ezekiel had been wholly within this mortal life. It would be impossible to deny that the Jews throughout this period, when the material of later messianism was developing, had some belief in immortality, but there is no evidence that this hope had become in any way connected with messianism. Yet after the return such a union could not long be postponed. The influence of Ezekiel's nationalism and of the later prophetic individualism was too strong. With Isa. 26: 1-19, that is, probably in the fourth century B. C.,²⁸ immortality appears with distinctness, but only as limited to pious Hebrews. By the time of Daniel²⁹ the belief in a resurrection has come to include others than Hebrews, and is joined with the messianic hope. Although this union concerns only the consummation of deliverance, like

²⁷ The limitation of the term "eschatological in the strict sense" to forecasts of the future involving a resurrection of the dead may appear somewhat arbitrary, but seems necessary for clear thinking. Some word like "neo-eschatological" might possibly be used to distinguish between the eschatology of prophetism and that of pharisaism.

²⁸ CHEYNE, *Introduction to Isaiah*, pp. 145 f., and art. "Isaiah" in *Encyclopædia Biblica*; DRIVER, *Introduction* (6th ed.), favors a date early in the fifth century B. C.

²⁹ Dan. 12: 1 f. On this matter in general see CHARLES, *Eschatology*, and his articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* and HASTINGS's *Dictionary of the Bible*. Unfortunately, he has not fully treated this particular phase of the subject.

so much else in Daniel, it was the beginning of that which was to prove so potent a supplement of the social messianism of the prophets, the new eschatology of later apocalyptic.

The line of development of messianism for a considerable period, however, does not seem to have followed this innovation of Daniel, fruitful as it was later to become, but kept true to its uneschatological and mundane limitations. The passage from glowing visions of a triumphant, re-established Israel to a belief in the literal character of the apocalyptic drapery is long, if easy, and one must look beyond Daniel to find it accomplished. For the early apocalyptic movement extraordinary word-paintings were intended to portray actual political and social regeneration. The Day of Jehovah itself involved the re-establishment of Jerusalem and certain institutions modeled on the strong lines of the older prophetism.³⁰ Apocalyptic itself, in its first portrayal of the emergence of an exulting nation from bitterest anguish, had a social content. Its figures were truly figurative. The new Judah was not to be in the sky or composed of imaginary beings, but was to be geographical and political.³¹

The same perception of a concrete and, so to speak, historical character of the messianic community is to be seen clearly in the great parent of all later apocalyptic, Daniel. How thoroughly true to its historical spirit is this writing throughout its elaborate imagery and symbolism, has been apparent to all interpreters. The various beasts represent, not world-epochs, but kingdoms which had been all too real in the affairs of the Jews, while the human being³² pictured the coming and triumph of a no less real kingdom of the saints. From the point of view of this prophecy, in fact, the early Maccabean uprising must have appeared a part of the divine deliverance promised the oppressed Pious. Yet in the same proportion as it is thus judged

³⁰ Cf. Zech. 12 : 5-9, and also the extraordinary readjustment of the topography of Judea in Zech., chap. 14.

³¹ Zech. 9 : 9, 10.

³² Dan. 7 : 13. It is impossible to see in **כבר אנוש** any other meaning. The contrast is clearly between beast-like and human symbols.

messianic must it also be declared social and political. The bands of fanatics which ranged through the little state, "smiting sinners in their anger and lawless men in their wrath," pulling down heathen altars, circumcising neglected children, guaranteeing, as far as with them lay, safety in the observance of the Torah and the developing oral law,³³ certainly regarded themselves as appointed by Jehovah, both for deliverance and for the reconstruction of the state.³⁴ Nor did success, as so often, prove fatal to the belief of the scribes and their followers that God's kingdom was soon to appear. It is impossible to see in the divinely promised king of the Sibylline Oracles³⁵ any other than one of the Asmonean house, Simon or possibly John Hyrcanus. Under him all war was to cease, and God would send the customary blessings and punishments of apocalypses. Even in Hellenistic Judaism the Day of Jehovah still fills the future, and the blessings of the new reign were to be made possible only by bloody wars and convulsions in nature. But the outcome of all struggle was to be a peaceful state, bountifully supported by a miraculously fruitful earth.³⁶ The nations would come under the law of Jehovah, and all the world become an empire with Jerusalem as its capital. In the other literature of the time may be traced similar expectations. Even Wisdom, with all its disillusion, could not quite disbelieve in a judgment of the heathen, a deliverance of God's people, and an everlasting Jewish empire under a Davidic dynasty.³⁷ The writer of the book of Tobit even ventures the hope that when the new Jewish empire is established all the heathen will be converted to God.³⁸ In other words, except in Dan. 12:1 f., messianism, in the Asmonean time, though expressed in terms of apocalyptic, had not become transcendental, but possessed still the social content of prophetism itself.

³³ I Macc. 2:42-70.

³⁴ I Macc. 5:55-62.

³⁵ III, 652-794.

³⁶ *Sibylline Oracles*, III, 652-794.

³⁷ Ecclus. 32:18, 19; 33:1 f.; 37:25; 47:11; 50:24; with the first of these references cf. Judith 16:17.

³⁸ Tob. 13:11; 14:6, 7. How far this hope ran through the Dispersion can hardly be said because of lack of data. But cf. BERTHOLET, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*, pp. 257-302, 337; and FRIEDLÄNDER, *Das Judentum in der vorchristlichen griechischen Welt*.

But evidently the new Judaism that rose when once the party of the Pharisees had differentiated itself from the Pious and the Sadducees, found ready to its hand all the elements of its late messianism. There were (1) the ineradicable belief that Jehovah would re-establish his people in indescribable glory, and (2) under a "legitimate" monarch, a son of David; (3) the equally fixed belief that He would judge the world and punish with indescribable sufferings the enemies of his chosen nation and, though this is less clear, the wicked generally, whether gentiles or Jews; (4) the belief in a resurrection of the dead indistinctly associated with the establishment of a regenerate Israel; (5) a literary form—apocalyptic—whose pictures were so vivid as readily to be mistaken for facts instead of symbols. During the period in which Christianity arose, *i. e.*, that of Roman suzerainty, these elements, each the outcome of prophetism, were combined into a completed messianism.

This development followed two lines; they were, *first*, the revolutionary messianism of the masses; *second*, the eschatological messianism of the literary classes, notably the Pharisees. Both were implicit in the messianism of the Maccabean age, but the former, following more closely the spirit of earlier prophetism, constituted a genuinely religio-social movement; while the latter, that of the Pharisees, following rather the later apocalyptic tendency, was scholastically religious, quite without social content.

[*To be continued.*]